

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

## STUDIES ON BHARTRHARI, 2 : BHARTRHARI AND MĪMĀMSĀ\*

(published in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 15 (1989), 101-117; *Studies in Mīmāṃsā*, Dr. Mandan Mishra Felicitation Volume, ed. R. C. Dwivedi, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994, pp. 371-388.)

1.1. Both Bhartrhari and Śabara pay a good deal of attention to the subject of *ūha* ‘modification, adjustment’. Bhartrhari discusses it in the first Āhnika of his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (AL 5.18-8.17, Sw 6.17-9.27, Ms 2b9-3c1), while parts of Adhyāya 9 of Śabara’s Bhāṣya deal with it. Two cases in particular are treated by both the authors and allow a detailed comparison.

The first case is most easily introduced with the help of Śabara’s Bhāṣya on Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 9.3.10:

*asti paśur agniṣomīyaḥ, yo dīkṣito yad agniṣomīyaṃ paśum ālabhata iti / tatra pāśaikatvābhidhāyī mantrah, aditiḥ pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam iti / tathā pāśabahutvābhidhāyī, aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān iti / ... / asti dvīpaśur vikṛtiḥ / maitraṃ śvetam ālabheta, vāruṇaṃ kṛṣṇam apāṃ cauṣadhīnāṃ ca saṃdhāvannakāma iti / tatra codakena pāśābhidhāyīnau māntrau prāptau / tayoḥ saṃśayaḥ / kim bahuvacanānto ’vikāreṇa pravartate, ekavacanāntasya nivṛttiḥ, uta bahuvacanānto nivartate, ekavacanānta ūhitavyaḥ, utobhayor api pravṛttir abhidhānavipratipattiś ca, uta ekavacanānta ūhitavyo bahuvacanānto ’pi na nivarteta / kim prāptam /*

“There is the Agniṣomīya animal [sacrifice] laid down in the text *yo dīkṣito yad agniṣomīyaṃ paśum ālabhata* (‘When one, being initiated, sacrifices the animal dedicated to Agni-Soma’). In connection with this there is a mantra, speaking of the [[372]] singleness of the noose (*pāśa*): *aditiḥ pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam* (‘May Aditi loosen this noose’); also [there is another mantra] speaking of the plurality of the noose: *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān*. (...) [Then again,] there is a modificatory sacrifice (*vikṛti*) [of the Agniṣomīya] at which two animals [are killed], laid down in the text [102] *maitraṃ śvetam ālabheta, vāruṇaṃ kṛṣṇam* etc. (‘The white [goat] should be sacrificed to Mitra and the black [goat] to Vāruṇa’). In accordance with the General Law, both the mantras that mention a noose come to be regarded as to be used at this [sacrifice of two animals]. In regard to [the use of] these two [mantras at this last sacrifice of two goats, there arise] the following questions: (a) Is [the word] in the plural form to be used in its unmodified form and that in the singular form to be excluded? Or (b) should the plural form be excluded and the singular form be modified [into a dula form]? Or (c) should both [the singular and the plural forms] be used, there being a diversity of expression (i.e. option) [regarding the one to be actually used in any particular case]? Or (d) should the singular form be modified, the plural form also [in its modified form(?)] not being excluded?” (tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, vol. III, p. 1561; modified).

\* This article was written with the financial assistance of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (N.W.O.).

The problem here raised is subsequently discussed in the Bhāṣya. Four solutions are proposed, the fourth one of which is finally accepted. For our present purpose it is however interesting to study the first solution, which is not accepted by Śābara. It reads (on PMS 9.3.10):

*anyāyas tv avikāreṇa / anyāyanigado bahuvacanānto 'vikāreṇa pravartate / ekavacanānto nivartitum arhati / kutaḥ / nāsyaiḥkasmīn pāṣe pravartamānasya dṛṣṭaḥ pratighātaḥ / yathaiḥkasmīn pāṣe pravartate, tathā dvayor api pravartitum arhati / nāsāv ekasya vācakaḥ, na dvayoḥ / evam āṛṣaś codako 'nugr̥hīto bhaviṣyati / itarathā hi ūhyamāne yathāprakṛti mantrō na kṛtaḥ syāt / na dvayoḥ pāṣayoḥ, ekasmimś ca pāṣe kaścīd viśeṣo 'sti / tasmād avikāreṇa bahuvacanāntaḥ prayujyate, ekavacanāntasya nivṛttir iti /*  
[[373]]

“That which is incompatible [should be used] in its unmodified form; [i.e.] the plural form, which is incompatible [with the primary sacrifice at which there is only one animal], is used [at the sacrifice of two animals] in its unmodified form, and the singular form should be excluded. Why so? [Because] we find no obstacle to its being used in the case of there being [only one animal and] one noose; [so that] just as it is used in the case of [one animal and] one noose, so should it be used also in the case of there being [two animals] and two [nooses; especially as the plural form] is expressive of neither one nor two. In thus [using the plural form in its unmodified form,] [103] the scriptural injunction of the General Law becomes honoured; while in the other case, if [the words] were modified, the mantra would not be used in the form in which it is used at the primary sacrifice. Nor is there any difference between one noose and two nooses [so far as the applicability of the plural form is concerned]. From all this it follows that the plural form is used in its unmodified form and the singular form is excluded.” (tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p. 1562; modified).

As said before, Śābara does not accept this position. He comes to the conclusion, under sūtra 9.3.13, that both the plural form and the singular form must be modified into a dual form. But this rejected position is rather close to the one adopted by Bhartṛhari, where he says in his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (AL 6.8-12; Sw 7.9-13; Ms 2c7-10; CE I 5.14-17):

*tathaiḥkasmīn eva prakṛtipāṣe pāṣān iti bahuvacanāntaḥ śrūyate / aditiḥ pāṣān pramumoktv iti / tatrāpi vikṛtāv ūho nāsti / vājasaneyinām tv ekavacanāntaḥ paṭhyate aditiḥ pāṣam iti / teṣām ūhaḥ prāpnoti / ... / athavā pāṣeṣu noha ity anena tu naigamavibhāṣā / bahuvacane sati yatheṣṭaḥ prayogo bhavati /*

The Ms. is very corrupt, but this reconstruction seems to be essentially correct. I translate:

“(…) The plural *pāṣān* is heard in *aditiḥ pāṣān pramumoktu* even though there is but one single noose (*pāṣa*) in the primary sacrifice. Here (...) there is no modification in the modifi-[[374]]catory sacrifice. But among the Vājasaneyins [the mantra] is read in the singular, *aditiḥ pāṣam* (...). For them modification applies. (...) Or the statement that there is no modification in the case of nooses (pl.!) expresses a Vedic option: where there is a plural number [of *pāṣa*] one uses [the word] as one wishes (i.e. either in the plural or adjusted to the situation).”

Bhartṛhari here represents the point of view of a particular Vedic school different from the Vājasaneyins. His Vedic school has laid down the rule that no modification takes place in the

case of the word *pāśa* used in the plural, and Bhartṛhari interprets this rule in two ways. Interestingly, the line *aditiḥ pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam* does not occur in the scriptures of the Vājasaneyins, but in TS 3.1.4.4. Bhartṛhari's mistake (what else could it be?) allows us to conclude that he was not a Taittirīya either. The [104] presence of *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān* in MS 1.2.15, KS 30.8 suggests that Bhartṛhari belonged to one of these two Vedic schools. Other evidence (see Rau, 1980; Bronkhorst, 1981; 1987) supports the view that he was a Maitrāyaṇīya.

The conclusion must be that Bhartṛhari's description of *ūha*, or rather of the absence of *ūha*, in *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktu* does not represent the position of any group of Mīmāṃsakas, but rather the position of the Maitrāyaṇīya branch of the Yajurveda. The Mīmāṃsakas on the other hand, or at any rate Śabara, did not confine their attention to one Vedic school. Only thus could they be confronted with the situation in which both the mantras *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān* and *aditiḥ pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam* apply. The question that remains is how the similarity between the point of view accepted by Bhartṛhari and the one rejected by Śabara is to be explained.

This question gains interest in view of the fact that Śabara too may have been a Maitrāyaṇīya. It is true that the Taittirīya texts are more often quoted in his Bhāṣya, but Garge (1952: 19 f.) has shown that Śabara's Bhāṣya nonetheless shows a clear preference for Maitrāyaṇīya readings wherever possible. Garge's data are perhaps most easily understood by assuming that Śabara, a Maitrāyaṇīya, continued and codified the Mīmāṃsaka [[375]] tradition which by itself had no particular predilection for Maitrāyaṇīya texts.

1.2. Both Bhartṛhari (AL 7.10-8.8; Sw 8.16-9.17; Ms 3a2-b6; CE I 6.11-7.7) and Śabara (on Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 9.3.22 and 9.3.27-4.27) deal in detail with the *adhṛigu* mantra, a passage that occurs in but slightly differing form in a number of texts.<sup>1</sup> Nothing in Bhartṛhari's discussion shows any influence from Śabara. Indeed it appears that the two authors disagree on how to deal with the part *ṣaḍviṃśatir asya vaṅkṛayas* 'it has twenty-six ribs'. Śabara winds up a long discussion on this matter by stating (on sūtra 9.4.16) that the total number of ribs must be mentioned where two or more animals are involved, not a repetition of the numeral 'twenty-six' (*iyattā vaṅkrīṇām prakṛtau vaktavyā / ihāpi sā codakena pradiśyate / tena nābhyāsaḥ / sa hi paśunimittakaḥ / tasmāt samasya vacanaṃ vaṅkrīṇām kartavyam iti*). Bhartṛhari makes an enigmatic remark after [105] citing the sentence that precedes *ṣaḍviṃśatir*. This remark — *tathāvyayam anekasmin paśau dvir abhyasyate* — can be interpreted with the help of MŚS 5.2.9.5 *yāny avyayāny anekāni tāni dvir abhyasyante* (...) *ṣaḍviṃśatiḥ ṣaḍviṃśatiḥ*. It thus comes to mean: "Then, in case there is more than one animal, the indeclinable [that follows, viz. *ṣaḍviṃśatiḥ*] is repeated."

<sup>1</sup> MS 4.13.4; KS 16.21; AiB 6.6-7 (2.6-7); TB 3.6.6; ĀśvŚS 3.3; ŚŚS 5.17.

Unlike Śabara, parts of Bhartṛhari's treatment of *ūha* show the influence of the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra. We saw how MŚS 5.2.9.5 was needed to understand one of Bhartṛhari's remarks. At two other occasions he makes a direct reference to 'the section on modification' (*ūhaprakaraṇa*) of the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra. Once (AL 7.5-6; Sw 8.11-12; Ms 2d10-11; CE I 6.6-8) he says:

*aghasad aghastām aghasann agrabhīṣur akṣann ity ūhaprakaraṇe paṭhyate*  
 "In the section on modification the forms *aghasat*, *aghasatām*, *aghasan*, *agrabhīṣuḥ* and *akṣan* are read."

This must refer to MŚS 5.2.9.6:

*haviṣi praiṣe sūktavāke ca adat adatām adan, ghasat ghasatām [[376]] ghasan, aghasat aghastām aghasan, karat karatām karan, agrabhīt agrabhīṣtām agrabhīṣuḥ, akṣan*

Then again (AL 7.20-21; Sw 9.3-4; Ms 3a8-9; CE I 6.21-22):

*tatrohaprakaraṇa evaiṣaṃ mātā pitā bhrātā sanābhisamsargīśabdā ity evamādīny anūhyānīti paṭhyate*  
 "(...) in the same section on modification it is read that of the [words mentioned earlier] the words indicative of siblings and kin *mātā*, *pitā*, *bhrātā* and the like should not be modified."

This reflects MŚS 5.2.9.7:

*mātā pitā bhrātā sagarbhyo ('nu) sakhā sayūthyo nābhirūpam āsamsargi śabdāś cakṣuḥ śrotraṃ vān manas tvaṇ medo havir barhiḥ śyenaṃ vakṣa ity anūhyam*  
 "His mother, his father, his brother from the same womb, his friend in the herd'; the form of *nābhi* joined with (the ending) *ā*, the words 'eye, ear, voice, mind, skin, fat, oblation(?), sacrificial grass, eagle-shaped breast', all these are not to be modified."  
 (tr. Van Gelder, p. 174).

[106]

Not all of Bhartṛhari's examples regarding *ūha* can be traced to the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, nor to any other Śrauta Sūtra. Of particular interest is the stanza which introduces his discussion of *ūha* in the *adhriḡu* mantra, and which has not been traced in any earlier work (AL 7.10-11; Sw 8.16-17; Ms 3a2-3; CE I 6.11-12):

*aṅgāni jñātināmā[ni upamā] cendriyāni ca /  
 etāni nohaṃ gacchanti adhriḡau viśamaṃ hi tat //*  
 "Limbs of the body, names of relatives, comparison and organs of sense, these do not undergo modification; for it (?) is irregular in the case of *adhriḡu*."

This stanza, which governs Bhartṛhari's ensuing discussion, must be assumed to have belonged to the ritualistic tradition of some [[377]] Vedic school, probably the

Maitrāyaṇīyas.<sup>2</sup> Bhartṛhari based his discussion of *ūha* not on some preexisting works of Mīmāṃsā but on ritual works which had no, or little, connection with Mīmāṃsā.

This situation allows us to understand how Śabara could describe and reject an opinion (on *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktu* etc., see section 1.1 above) which is so close to Bhartṛhari's. The Mīmāṃsakas, who took a broader view of the sacrificial rites than those adhering to the traditions of particular Vedic schools, would nonetheless borrow ideas from individual Vedic schools, either to accept or to reject them. All we have to assume is that Śabara was acquainted with at least some of these ritual books.

It seems that the books which Bhartṛhari used did not survive him for long. The above stanza (*aṅgāni...*) is quoted by Kumārila in his *Tantravārttika* on *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* 1.3.24 (p. 197) and ascribed to a *ṭikākāra* who is also credited (p. 209) with the authorship of the stanza that we know as *Vākyapadīya* 2.14 (Swaminathan, 1963: 69), i.e., apparently to Bhartṛhari. That is to say, Bhartṛhari is here quoted as an authority on *ūha* in his own right.<sup>3</sup> [107]

1.3. Another instance where Bhartṛhari gives evidence of drawing upon a tradition quite independent of the Mīmāṃsakas occurs on P. 1.1.5 and consists of an illustration with the help of the *Śunaskarṇastoma* sacrifice (AL 118.3; Sw 137.26-138.1; Ms 39a7-8):

*śunaskarṇastomayajñavad etat syāt, yathā pradhānasya maraṇenārthina iṣṭim pravartayantī*<sup>4</sup>

“This is like the *Śunaskarṇastoma* sacrifice: desirous of the main thing by means of death, they cause the sacrifice to proceed.”

The *Śunaskarṇa Agniṣṭoma* sacrifice is discussed in Śabara's *Bhāṣya* on PMS 10.2.57-61. This sacrifice is enjoined by the injunction “Desiring one's own death one should perform this sacrifice, if he wishes that he should reach the Heavenly Region without any disease” (*marāṇakāmo hy etena yajeta, yaḥ kāmayetānāmayaḥ svargaṃ lokam iyām iti*; tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p. [[378]] 1721). The question raised under PMS 10.2.57-58 is whether or not the sacrifice should be continued after the sacrificer has taken his life by throwing himself into the fire. The answer is that the sacrifice must be completed. A number of reasons is given for this, none of them even resembling Bhartṛhari's. This is true to the extent that Pārthasārathi Miśra in his *Śāstradīpikā* on PMS 10.2.57-58 (*adhikaraṇa* 23, vol. II, p. 334 f.) quotes Bhartṛhari as authority when accepting that point of view (cf. Swaminathan, 1961: 315-16):

<sup>2</sup> Bhartṛhari's independence from the influence of Mīmāṃsā when dealing with ritual details makes this a more likely assumption than that this stanza belonged to the Mīmāṃsā work in verse with which he appears to have been acquainted. See section 2, below.

<sup>3</sup> Helārāja on *Vākyapadīya* 3.14.591 (590), p. 413, l. 24-25, quotes the same stanza and calls it ‘tradition of the knowers of *ūha*’ (*ūhavidām āmnāyaḥ*).

<sup>4</sup> The Ms reading has been emended with the help of the quotation by Pārthasārathi Miśra; see below.

*svarga evātra maraṇenārthinaḥ phalaṃ na maraṇam / maraṇakāma ity aṅgīkṛtamaraṇa ity arthaḥ / tena yo hy evaṃ jñātvā svargaṃ prāpnavānīti kāmāyate, tasyāyaṃ kratuḥ / tathā ca haribhir uktam 'pradhānasya maraṇenārthina ijjāṃ pravartayanti' iti /* "Heaven is here the fruit he wishes [to attain] by means of death, not death [itself]. The words 'desiring [one's own] death' (*marāṇakāma*) mean 'accepting [one's own] death'. Therefore, this sacrifice is [meant] for him who, knowing this, wishes to attain to heaven. This has been expressed by [Bhartṛ]hari with the words 'desirous of the main thing (i.e. heaven) by means of death they cause the sacrifice to proceed'."

[108]

Pārthasārathi's quotation does not only cast light on the form and meaning of Bhartṛhari's remark; it also indicates that Pārthasārathi (10<sup>th</sup> century A.D. according to Ramaswami Sastri, 1937) had no (longer?) access to the sources from which Bhartṛhari drew his example.

1.4. We turn to another passage where Bhartṛhari to all appearances draws upon the tradition of the Maitrāyaṇīyas. It occurs in his comments on the line *prayājāḥ savibhaktikāḥ kāryāḥ* of the Mahābhāṣya (I.3.10). Bhartṛhari is here clearly influenced by the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra (5.1.2.6) which reads:

*punar ādheye prayājānuyājānām purastād vopariṣṭād vā vibhaktiḥ kūr्याt / ye yajāmahe 'samidhaḥ samidho 'gnā ājyasya vyanṭv' agnir agnis 'tanūnapād agnā ājyasya vetv' agnim agnim 'ido 'gnā [[379]] ājyasya vyanṭv' agner agner 'barhīr agnā ājyasya vetv' agner agner iti /*

"When [fire] is to be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary and final offerings, as follows: *ye yajāmahe* etc."

The first and introductory sentence of this passage is included in Bhartṛhari's remarks on the subject, which however go beyond the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra in giving some kind of justification for the choice of 'vibhaktis' (i.e. *agnir agniḥ* etc.) and even lead to an outcome that is different in one point; he also gives an alternative. Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā reads (AL 12.25-13.4; Sw 15.21-16.1; Ms 5a2-5; CE I 11.10-14):

*vibhaktinām api sarvāsām prayoge prāpte yā dvyakṣara vā satyaś caturakṣarā vā bhavantīti vacanād agnināgninēti na prayujyate / tathā na śabdajāmi kūr्याt / śabdajāmi hi tad bhavati yat pañcamyantam / tasmād agner agner ity anena rūpeṇa śaṣṭhyantam prayujyate / punarādheye prayājānuyājānām purastād vopariṣṭād vā vibhaktiḥ kūr्याt / narāśaṃso agnim agnim iti vā ubhayathā drṣṭatvāt /*

"Although it would follow (from what precedes in Bhartṛhari's commentary) that all case-endings be used, the form *agnināgninā* is not used because it has been stated 'which have two syllables or four syllables'. Similarly one should not use *śabdajāmi*. *Śabdajāmi* is that which has an ablative ending. Therefore it is the genitive which is used in the form *agner agneḥ*, [not the ablative]. When [fire] is to [109] be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary offerings. Or *narāśaṃso... agnim agnim* [is used instead of *tanūnapād... agnim agnim*] because it is seen both ways."

This shows that according to Bhartṛhari the following four 'vibhaktis' are to be used: *agnir agniḥ* (nom.), *agnim agnim* (acc.), *agner agneḥ* (gen.), *agnāv agnau* (loc.).

The essential correctness of the above reading of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā is confirmed by Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī's [[380]] Ratnaprakāśa, a subcommentary on the Mahābhāṣya. It says in this connection (p. 56-57):

*tatrāpi sambuddhitāṇe 'ntānām na prayogaḥ, 'āvṛtṭyā dvyakṣarāḥ santaś caturakṣarā bhavanti' iti vacanāt / sambuddhyantasya dvyakṣaratve 'pi dvirvacanottaram pūrvarūpe sati 'agne 'gne' iti tryakṣaratvāt / tāṇe 'ntayor ādita eva dvyakṣaratvābhāvāc ca / tathā nasyantam api na prayoktavyam, 'na śabdajāmi kuryāt, śabdajāmi hi tad bhavati yat pañcamyantam' iti vacanāt / ... / evam ca caturṣv avaśiṣṭaprayājamantresu yathākramam prathamādvitīyāsaṣṭhīsaptamyekavacanāntānām agniśabdaprakṛtikānām padānām prayogaḥ kartavyaḥ / ... / tathā cāyam purastātparayogaḥ: 'ye yajāmahe agnir agniḥ samidhaḥ samidho 'gna ājyasya vyantu vausaṭ' / 'ye yajāmahe agnim agniḥ tanūnapād agnā ājyasya vetu vausaṭ' / 'ye yajāmahe agner agner idō 'gna ājyasya vyantu vausaṭ' / 'ye yajāmahe agnāv agnau barhir agna ājyasya vetu vausaṭ' iti / paścātprayogas tu 'ye yajāmahe samidhaḥ samidho 'gna ājyasya vyantu agnir agniḥ vausaṭ' ityādīḥ /*

It is true that Śivarāmendra refers immediately after this to Viṣṇumiśra's Kṣīroda, a now lost commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, for further elucidation. It is also true that he then mentions Bhartṛhari's commentary (*haritīkā*) and quotes from it a passage which clearly belongs to Bhartṛhari's subsequent treatment of 'vibhaktis' in accordance with the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra (see Bronkhorst, 1981: 174). Yet there can be no doubt that also the above passage was composed under the direct or indirect influence of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā.

We return to Bhartṛhari's passage. It shows relationship with the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, as we have seen. It further quotes a line that has close affinity with MS 1.7.3, KS 9.1, KapS 8.4<sup>5</sup> in order to justify that [110] only 'vibhaktis' with two or four syllables are acceptable. Then however it deviates from any known text by quoting a remarkable rule: One should not use *śabdajāmi*; *śabdajāmi* is that which has an ablative ending. Subsequently Bhartṛhari observes that *tanūnapād* is sometimes replaced by *narāśaṃso*. Something similar was noted by the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on ĀśvŚS 2.8.6 (see Rau, 1980: 176) and by Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī (see Bronkhorst, 1981: 174), both in connection with the Āśvalāyana version of the 'vibhaktis'.

[[381]]

1.5. What is the source from which Bhartṛhari derived his detailed knowledge on ritual matters? The most likely answer is that he used Prayoga manuals belonging to the Maitrāyaṇīyas. Few old Prayogas have survived and their study has hardly begun. Yet the suspicion could be voiced that "some sort of Prayogas must have been in vogue even before the composition of the Śrautasūtras proper" (Śrautakośa Vol. I, English section, Part I, Preface, p. 7; see already Hillebrandt, 1879: XV; 1897: 38). Bhide (1979: 150 f.) studied two extant Prayogas of the Cāturmāsya sacrifices and compared them with the Hiraṇyakeśi Śrauta Sūtra, under which they resort. Interestingly, the older of these two Prayogas, by Mahādeva

<sup>5</sup> All these texts have *yad dvyakṣarāḥ satīś caturakṣarāḥ kriyant[re]*.

Somayājīn, deviates a number of times from the Hiraṇyakeśi Śrauta Sūtra. This shows that Bhartṛhari may indeed have used Prayoga manuals belonging to his Vedic school, and that the few deviations from the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra which we noticed above do not prove that these manuals belonged to another school than that of the Mānavas.

2.1. We conclude from the above that Bhartṛhari was not a Mīmāṃsaka. Yet he was acquainted with Mīmāṃsā. He uses the word ‘Mīmāṃsaka’ several times in his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya. The line *siddhā dyauḥ siddhā pṛthivī siddham ākāśam iti* (Mbh I.6.18-19) is elucidated by Bhartṛhari’s remark (AL 22.23; Sw 27.19; Ms 8a4; CE I 19.11): *ārhatānām mīmāṃsakānām ca naivāsti vināśaḥ eṣām* “According to the Jainas and Mīmāṃsakas there is no destruction of these”, i.e., of sky, earth and ether. At another place (AL 29.10-11; Sw 35.2; Ms 9d7; CE I 24.15) Bhartṛhari quotes the words *darśanasya parārthatvāt* in a discussion concerning the eternality of words. This must be a reflection of PMS 1.1.18 *nityas tu syād darśanasya parārthatvāt*. Note however that Bhartṛhari’s quote does not only lack the initial words of the sūtra, it also has an additional word at the end, [111] probably *vīprapravṛttatvāt* which is absent from the sūtra.

The following quotation in the Dīpikā seems to throw more light on Bhartṛhari’s relationship with Mīmāṃsā. In the third Āhnika Bhartṛhari proclaims (AL 96.3-4; Sw 113.14-15; Ms 31b4-5; CE III 3.19-20):

*nānantaryam sambandhahetuḥ / evaṃ hy ucyate / arthato hy asamarthānām  
ānantaryam akāraṇam /*  
[[382]]

“[Mere] contiguity is no cause of relationship. Thus, verily, it is said: ‘contiguity is no cause of relationship between [words] which are not semantically connected’.”

The quotation in this passage had to be reconstructed to some extent, and this could be done with the help of PMS 4.3.11 (*api vāmnānasāmarthyāc codanārthena gamyetārthānām hy arthavattvena vacanāni pratiyante ’rthato hy asamarthānām ānantarye ’py asambandhas tasmāc chrutyekadeśaḥ saḥ*), as pointed out by Palsule (Notes p. 66 of his edition; cf. Swaminathan, 1961: 314). What is more, the quoted line occurs in precisely that form in a verse cited in Vaidyanātha’s *Chāyā* (p. 160, 162) and which reads:

*yasya yenābhisambandho (/ārthasambandho) dūrasthasyāpi tena saḥ / arthato hy asamarthānām ānantaryam akāraṇam //*

This suggests that Bhartṛhari knew a Mīmāṃsā work which contained verse.

This impression is strengthened by another quotation in the Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā, on P. 1.1.46, in the context of sequential order. Here Bhartṛhari cites the following verse (AL 274.1-2; Ms 95b1-2):



*śruter arthāc ca pāthāc ca pravṛtteś ca manīṣiṇaḥ /  
sthānān mukhyāc ca dharmānām āhuḥ kramāvidaḥ kramān //*

“Those sages who know about sequential order say that the sequential order of things (?) [is determined] on the basis of scriptural assertion, meaning, [order of] text, commencement, place and [order of] the principal.”

This verse is close to PMS 5.1.1-15, as already observed by Swaminathan (1961: 317). All its elements occur there: *śruti* in PMS 5.1.1 (*śrutilakṣaṇam ānupūrvyaṁ tatpramāṇatvāt*),<sup>6</sup> *artha* in 5.1.2 (*arthāc ca*), *pātha* is the [112] subject-matter of 5.1.4, even though not called by this name, *pravṛtti* appears in 5.1.8 (*pravṛtṭyā tulyakālānām tadupakramāt*), *sthāna* in 5.1.13 (*sthānāc cotpattisaṁyogāt*), *mukhyakrama* finally in 5.1.14 (*mukhyakrameṇa vā 'ṅgānām [[383]] tadarthatvāt*). Again we are left with the impression that Bhartṛhari was acquainted with a work on Mīmāṃsā which contained verse.

2.2. The fact that the work on Mīmāṃsā used by Bhartṛhari appears to have contained verses may help us in identifying its author. Only one author on Mīmāṃsā is thought to have written an early work on this subject which contained verses; this is Bhavadāsa. Sucaritamiśra's commentary Kāśikā on Kumārila's Ślokaṇvārttika quotes a half verse from Bhavadāsa<sup>7</sup> (Kane, 1929: esp. 153, fn. 3). It seems clear that Bhavadāsa preceded Śabara (Kane, 1929; Mishra, 1942: 16-17; Frauwallner, 1968: 100 f., 107, 112 f.).<sup>8</sup>

The assumption that Bhartṛhari used Bhavadāsa's work does not conflict with anything in the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, nor in the Vākyapadīya, as far as I know. It may be noted that on one occasion, where we seem to know the definition used by Bhavadāsa, Bhartṛhari does not quote Bhavadāsa but gives a definition of his own. Śabara on PMS 12.1.1 quotes a definition of the word *prasaṅga*: *prasaṅgaśabdārtho 'nyair uktaḥ, evam eva prasaṅgaḥ syād vidyamāne svake vidhāv iti*. The quoted line is half a śloka, the whole of which is given on PMS 11.1.1; it is plausible that it derives from Bhavadāsa. Bhartṛhari gives an own definition of this technical Mīmāṃsā term in his commentary (AL 45.4-5; Sw 54.2-3; Ms 14b4-5; CE I 37.11-12): *yady arthī prayojako anyadvāreṇārthaṁ pratipadyate sa prasaṅga ity ucyate*. A closer investigation shows however that Bhartṛhari's definition agrees contentwise with Bhavadāsa's śloka, whereas Śabara has changed the interpretation of the verse so as to make it suit his own ideas. See Bronkhorst, 1986.

2.3. If indeed we can accept that Bhartṛhari used a text on Mīmāṃsā different from Śabara's Bhāṣya we may be in a position to understand a passage that occupied Yudhiṣṭhira

<sup>6</sup> Bhartṛhari's example of *śruti* is *hṛdayasyāgre 'vadyati, atha jihvāyāḥ, atha vakṣasaḥ*. The same example is given by Śabara under PMS 5.1.5.

<sup>7</sup> *bhavadāsenā cōktam: athāta ity ayaṁ śabda ānantarye prayujyate*.

<sup>8</sup> Frauwallner (1968: 101) places him in the first half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

Mīmāṃsaka (1973: I: 385, fn. 1). It reads (AL 31.2-3; Sw 36.19-21; Ms 10b7-8; CE I 25.24-26):

[113]

*dharmaprayojano veti mīmāṃsakadarśanam / avasthita eva dharmah / sa tv  
agnihotrādibhir abhivyaajyate / tatpreritas tu phalado bhavati /*  
[[384]]

“[The words in the Mahābhāṣya (I.8.5-6)] *dharmaprayojano vā...* ‘bringing about dharma’<sup>9</sup> [express] the view of the Mīmāṃsakas. [According to them] dharma is eternal. It is however manifested by [such sacrifices as] Agnihotra etc. Instigated by these [dharma] produces result.”

Mīmāṃsaka contrasts this statement with a passage from Jayanta Bhaṭṭa’s Nyāyamañjarī which reads (p. 664):

*vṛddhamīmāṃsakāḥ yāgādikarmanirvartyam apūrvaṃ nāma dharmam abhivadanti  
yāgādikarmaiva śābarā bruvate*

“The old Mīmāṃsakas declare dharma, [also] called apūrva, to be produced by ritual activities such as sacrifices. The followers of Śābara say that the ritual activities such as sacrifices are themselves [dharma].”<sup>10</sup>

The two passages combined seem to indicate that the Mīmāṃsakas known to Bhartṛhari were older than Śābara. Mīmāṃsaka goes further and concludes that Bhartṛhari himself is much earlier than Śābara. This need not be true. In fact, Bhartṛhari’s commentary contains an indication that its author knew a view according to which the constituents of the sacrifice are dhar-[114]ma. This indication consists in the twice quoted phrase *dadhimadvādayo dharmah* ‘curds, honey, etc. constitute dharma’. The phrase is quoted (twice) in a difficult and corrupt passage, which may however be reconstituted as follows (Ms 11b3-5; AL 34.8-12; Sw 40.21-25; CE I 28.17-20):

*yathā pūrvakālam prayuktāni dīrghasatpātrāṇi idānīm aprayujyamānāny api  
dadhimadvādayo dharmā iti karmatādīviśayaḥ sidhyata evam anyaiḥ prayuktānām  
sarvakālam idānīm aprayujyamānānām apy anuvidhānam yuktam / ye tu  
dadhimadvādayo dharmā iti teṣāṃ vyākaraṇe ’yam artho na sambhavati / na hi iha  
śabdoccāraṇāt dharmā iti /*

This may tentatively be translated:

<sup>9</sup> We must assume that Bhartṛhari considers *prayojana* here synonymous with *prayojaka* ‘bringing about’ for the following reasons: (i) otherwise *tatpreritas* makes no sense; (ii) a few lines further down we find the explanation *dharmasya... prayojaka[h]*. Joshi and Roodbergen (1973: 82, fn. 326) explain this meaning as follows: “The word *prayojana* is formed by adding the suffix *Lyuṭ* (i.e. *ana*, P. 7.1.1) to the stem *prayuj*, in the sense of *karaṇa*: ‘instrument’ (P. 3.3.117). Thus the meaning of *prayojana* can be analyzed as *prayujyate anena tat prayojanam*: ‘that by which something is regulated is (called) *prayojana*’. Taken in this sense, *prayojana* comes to mean *prayojaka*: ‘regulator’.” It seems however more correct to account for *prayojana* in this sense by P. 3.3.113 (*krtyalyuṭo bahulam*). This is done, e.g., by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in his *Śabdakaustubha* (vol. I, p. 11): *atra prayujyate pravartyate ’neneti karaṇalyuḍantaḥ prayojayati kārtrvyūtpattyā bāhulakāt kārtrlyuḍanto vā ubhayathāpi pravartakavidhiparaḥ puṁliṅgaḥ prayojanaśabda ekaḥ / phalaparaḥ klībo ’paraḥ /*

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Śābara’s Bhāṣya on PMS 1.1.2: *yo ho yāgam anuṣṭhati taṃ dhārmika iti samācākṣate / yaś ca yasya kartā sa tena vyapadiśyate / yathā pācako lāvaka iti /*

“Just as long Soma sacrifices were used formerly, and even [[385]] though they are not used now, the aim of sacrificial activity is attained since curds, honey etc. constitute dharma; so the laying down of rules for things which have been used by others all the time is proper, even though these things are not used now. But this is not possible in grammar for those who [hold] that curds, honey etc. constitute dharma. For no dharma comes forth from uttering sound.”

Much is unclear in this passage. But it shows that we do not have to conclude that Bhartṛhari lived much before Śabara. It seems more appropriate to conjecture that Bhartṛhari used a text on Mīmāṃsā older than Śabara’s Bhāṣya, most probably Bhavadāsa’s Vṛtti. We are however fully justified in thinking that Bhartṛhari cannot have lived long *after* Śabara.

3. The above observations, if correct, allow us to draw the following conclusions. Bhartṛhari was acquainted with Mīmāṃsā, but did not use it where we would expect him to use it. In the context of ritual details he rather draws upon another tradition, most probably on the traditional manuals current in his Vedic school, that of the Maitrāyaṇīyas. And where he makes references to Mīmāṃsā, it is never to Śabara’s Bhāṣya, but rather to a Mīmāṃsā work in verse, or containing verse, which has not survived, but may have been Bhavadāsa’s Vṛtti. He may have known the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, or a part of it, but this is not certain.

[115], [[387]]

## REFERENCES

Bhartṛhari: *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*.

- 1) Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1970. (Post-Graduate and Research Department Series No. 8.)
  - 2) Partly edited by V. Swaminathan under the title *Mahābhāṣya Tīkā*. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University. 1965. (Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series Vol. 11.)
  - 3) Manuscript reproduced. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1980.
  - 4) ‘Critical edition’. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1983 ff.
- Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: *Śabdakaustubha*. Vol. I, Fasc. I to IV. Edited by Pandit Sri Mukund Sastri Puntamkar. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1933.
- Bhide, V. V. (1979): *The Cāturmāsya Sacrifices*. With special reference to the Hiranyakeśi Śrautasūtra. Pune: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class B, No. 5.)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981): “On some Vedic quotations in Bhartṛhari’s works.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7, 173-75.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1986): “Tantra and Prasaṅga.” *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* 3, 77-80.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1987): “Further remarks on Bhartṛhari’s Vedic affiliation.” *Studies in Indian culture*. S. Ramachandra Rao Felicitation Volume. Bangalore, pp. 216-223.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1968): *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 259. Band, 2. Abhandlung; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens, Heft 6.)
- Garge, Damodar Vishnu (1952): *Citations in Śabara-Bhāṣya*. Poona: Deccan College. (Deccan College Dissertation Series, 8.)

- Helārāja: *Prakīrṇaprakāśa*. In: *Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari with the commentary of Helārāja*, edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. 2 parts. Poona: Deccan College. 1963-73.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred (1879): *Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer*. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred (1897): *Ritual-Litteratur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III. Band, 2. Heft.)
- [[388]]
- Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: *Nyāyamañjarī*. Vol. I. Edited by K. S. Varadacharya. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute.
- [116]
- Jha, Ganganatha (tr.) (1933-36): *Shabara-Bhāṣya*. 3 vol. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Jha, Ganganatha (1942): *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*. Benares: Benares Hindu University.
- Joshi, S. D., and Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1973): *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Tatpuruṣāhnikā (P.2.2.2-2.2.23)*. Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 7.)
- Kane, P. V. (1929): "Bhavadāsa and Śabarasvāmin." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 10, 153-54.
- Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: *Tantravārttika*. See under 'Śabara'.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (1973): *Samskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Parts I-III. Sonipat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. Samvat 2030.
- Mishra, Umesha (1942): "Critical bibliography." Appendix to Jha, 1942.
- Pārthasārathi Miśra: *Śāstradīpikā*. Edited by P. N. Pattabhīrama Sastri. New Delhi: Śrī Lāla Bahādura Śāstri Kendriya Samskṛta Vidyāpīṭham. Part II. 1980-81. (Samskṛta Vidyāpīṭha Granthamālā 38.)
- Patañjali: *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.
- Ramaswami Sastri, K. S. (1937): "Date of Pārthasārathimiśra and sequence of his works." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 13, 488-97.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1980): "Bhartrhari und der Veda." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 5/6 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), 167-80.
- Śabara: *Mīmāṃsā Bhāṣya*. In: *Mīmāṃsādarśana*. Edited by Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyāṅkara and Pt. Gaṇeśaśāstrī Joṣī. Poona: Ānandāśrama. 1973-84. (Ānandāśrama Samskṛtagranthāvali 97.)
- Śrautakośa. Vol. I, English section, Part I. By R. N. Dandekar; preface by C. G. Kashikar. Poona: Vaidika Samśodhana Maṇḍala. 1958.
- Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī: *Ratnaprakāśa*. In: *Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa Vyākhyānāni*. Adhyāya 1 Pāda 1 Āhnikā 1-4. Edited by M. S. Narasimhacharya. Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie. 1973. (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 51,1.)
- Swaminathan, V. (1961): "Bhartrhari and Mīmāṃsā." *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference* 20 (1959), vol. II, part 1, 309-17.
- Swaminathan, V. (1963): "Bhartrhari's authorship of the commentary on the Mahābhāṣya." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 27, 59-70.
- Vaidyanātha: *Chāyā*. In: *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya*, edited by Raghunath Kāśhīnāth Shāstrī and Sivadatta D. Kudāla. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgar Press. 1932.
- [117]
- van Gelder, Jeanette M. (tr.) (1963): *The Mānava Śrautasūtra*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture. (Śata-Piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures, Vol. 27.)

[[385]]

## ABBREVIATIONS

AiB	<i>Aitareya Brāhmaṇa</i>
AL	Abhyankar and Limaye's edition of Bhartrhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
ĀśvŚS	<i>Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
CE	'Critical Edition' of Bhartrhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
KS	<i>Kāthaka Samhitā</i>

KapS	<i>Kapīṣṭhala Saṃhitā</i>
Mbh	<i>Mahābhāṣya</i>
Ms	Manuscript of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
MS	<i>Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā</i>
MŚS	<i>Mānava Śrauta Sūtra</i>
[[386]]	
PMS	<i>Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra</i>
ŚŚS	<i>Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
Sw	Swaminathan's edition of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
TB	<i>Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa</i>
TS	<i>Taittirīya Saṃhitā</i>